



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of projects of the International Centre for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (IC-ISID) ⁽¹⁾:

Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the cement sector

and

Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the paper and pulp sector

UNIDO SAP ID: 150267 and 150282

December 2017

¹ IC-ISID is a joint initiative of the Department of Industry Policy and Promotion (DIPP), Government of India, and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Contents

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
1.	Project factsheet	3
	Cement Project factsheet:	3
	Paper Project factsheet:	3
2.	Project context.....	4
	<i>Rationale and origin of the projects:</i>	4
	<i>Cement Project</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
	<i>ORIGIN OF THE PROJECT</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.	Project objective: please briefly describe the project objectives and its components	5
	Project implementation arrangements.....	5
4.	Budget information:	10
II.	Evaluation purpose and scope.....	12
III.	Evaluation approach and methodology.....	13
1.	Data collection methods.....	13
2.	Evaluation key questions and criteria	14
3.	Rating system.....	15
IV.	Evaluation process	15
V.	Time schedule and deliverables.....	15
VI.	Evaluation team composition	16
VII.	Reporting.....	17
VIII.	Quality assurance	17
	Annex 1: Project Results Framework	18
	Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria	21
	Annex 3: Job descriptions	28
	Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report.....	34
	Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality	35

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT²

1. Project factsheet

Cement Project factsheet:

Project title	Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the cement sector
SAP ID	150267
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Country	India
Project donor(s)	India
Project approval date	7 May 2015
Project implementation start date	15 October 2015
Expected duration at project approval	22 months
Expected implementation end date	31 March 2018
Executing partners	UNIDO
Donor funding	1,270,685 USD
Total project cost (USD)	1,270,685 USD
Planned terminal evaluation date	Q1 2018

(Source: Project document)

Paper Project factsheet:

Project title	Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the paper and pulp sector
SAP ID	150282
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Country	India
Project donor(s)	India
Project approval date	18 July 2015
Project implementation start date	15 October 2015
Expected duration at project approval	21 months
Expected implementation end date	31 March 2018
Executing partners	UNIDO
Donor funding	1,644,150 USD
Total project cost (USD)	1,644,150 USD
Planned terminal evaluation date	Q1 2018

² Data in this chapter is to be validated by the Consultant against the project document and any changes should be reflected in the evaluation report.

2. Project context

This Independent Terminal Evaluation covers two different projects implemented by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) in India. The first is the project “*Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the cement sector*” – SAP 150267, hereinafter referred to as ‘Cement Project’ – the second is “*Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the paper and pulp sector*” – SAP 150282, Paper Project.

Despite tackling two different sectors of the Indian economy, namely the cement and the paper and pulp industries, the two projects arise from the same issue, i.e. the imbalance between a larger internal production and a significantly lower demand. This particular situation led to the need of taking advantage of UNIDO’s expertise in building up cooperation and coordination to create the necessary preconditions in order to increase the volume of export within the sectors.

Rationale and origin of the projects:

Cement Project

India is the second largest cement producing country in the world, only trailing China in terms of quantity and technology, producing about 7% of the global production. The country experiences a particular situation where the production is much greater than its domestic demand. The per capita cement consumption is relatively low at 180 kg, much below the global average of 450 kg, although India is the second largest cement producer worldwide. This mismatch has made India looking outwards to other markets to export the excess, with the realization that there is a need to be cost competitive and be able to export. India is among the world’s top ten exporters of cement both in value and volume; but it has yet to compete with countries such as Turkey, China, Pakistan, Vietnam, Japan and the USA, leading to a significantly reduced market share since 2012.

To address this issue, this project was formulated in 2015 in line with the direct request from and consultation with the Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion (DIPP), Government of India (GoI), as well as relevant industry associations. It has been implemented in collaboration with the International Centre for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (IC-ISID) in New Delhi, India. The project is expected to be completed by the 31st of March 2018.

Paper Project

The Indian paper industry accounts for 2.6% of the world’s production of paper. In the past two decades, a widening gap between supply and demand has developed, with the former significantly falling short of the latter. An important reason for insufficient supply is due to firms’ inadequate productivity performance, which in turn is related to employment of relatively unsophisticated technologies, untrained staff, inadequate management practices, weak handling of waste emissions as well as suboptimal resource efficiency.

The project was developed in response to a request from the Government of India (GoI) dated 18th July 2015. It was started in October 2015 and was expected to be completed at the end of March 2018. The project’s objective is to introduce new and more advanced technologies, provide up-to-date skills to staff and transfer the most knowledge in the above mentioned areas.

Firms’ successful enhancement of their productivity performance are likely to bring the additional advantage of improved international competitiveness, which can allow firms to enter export markets.

There is thus significant growth potential to be seized by the industry, both domestically and internationally.

The target beneficiaries are firms, which serve as demonstration units, and technical institutions such as the Indian Paper Manufacturers Association (IPMA) and the Central Paper and Pulp Research Institute (CPPRI), the Indian Agro and Recycled Paper Mills Association (IARPMA), the Indian Newsprint Manufacturer's Association (INMA) as well as the Indian Recycled Paper Mills Association (IRPMA). In the longer term, it is expected that the strengthening of such institutions will enable sustainability of the project activities and self-sufficiency of the sector.

3. Projects' objectives

Cement Project

The objective of the project is to bolster the capacity and capability of technical institutions such as the National Council for Cement and Building Materials (NCCBM) to enable them to better support clusters and individual SMEs in their efforts to enhance their productivity performance and enter export markets. Such support entails transfer of relatively advanced technologies, skills development of staff, enhanced management practices and building knowledge for increased resource efficiency and emission reduction. The final goal is to strengthen the global competitive position of the Indian cement sector.

The project consists of 7 different outputs, 4 in the inception phase, 1 in the implementation phase and 2 in the post-implementation phase.

Following are the key outputs:

1. Undertaking analysis and drafting a report of the cement sector to develop an accurate baseline scenario.
2. Conducting a diagnostic study, first to assess the gaps in technology and skills in NCCBM and, secondly, to gain an in-depth understanding of and global best practices.
3. Developing Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to analyse the performance of the cement sector.
4. An action plan for capacity building for NCCBM.
5. Upgrading of skills and capacity through mechanisms of technology transfer (transfer, adaptation, and implementation), structured and focused expert dialogue, international study tours, twinning programmes and mechanisms of training and learning-by-doing.
6. Drafting and presentation of the final report and,
7. A terminal evaluation report of the project.

Project implementation arrangements

INCEPTION PHASE

During the inception phase activities of planning and logistics have been carried out with the aim of ensuring that all key stakeholders are on board, that planned activities are in line with the expected goal, reasonable KPIs are developed and an action plan for capacity building is formulated.

During this stage the following outputs have been achieved:

1. Output 1: Reports on the cement sector (responsibility: NCCBM, UNIDO)
 - 1.1 Review of global best practices on management of the cement sector
 - 1.2 Global view of: - Energy usage and energy efficient solutions

- Waste derived fuels
 - CO2 emissions and green technologies
 - Patents and IPRs
 - Global best practices
 - Up-to-date technologies
- 1.3 Analysis of results (activities 1.1-1.2)
 - 1.4 Drafting of findings (activities 1.1-1.3)
2. Output 2: Diagnostic study of NCCBM (responsibility: UNIDO)
 - 2.1 Analysis of the issues/technology gaps faced by NCCBM
 - 2.2 Analysis of the skills gaps faced by NCCBM. Information will be disaggregated by sex
 - 2.3 Analysis of the gaps in management best practices faced by NCCBM. Information will be disaggregated by sex
 - 2.4 Analysis of NCCBMs international and technical support network
 - 2.5 Analysis of current technology types promoted by NCCBM (the usage of energy, type of process, fuel type, CO2 emissions, waste, etc.)
 - 2.6 Drafting of findings as a report
 3. Output 3: List of LPs (responsibility: NCCBM, UNIDO)
 - 3.1 Utilize a six step process for the development of KPIs, namely:
 - Step 1 – Create objective
 - Step 2 – Describe results
 - Step 3 – Identify measures
 - Step 4 – Define thresholds
 - Step 5 – Upload structure/data into a performance management system
 - Step 6 – Interpret results
 4. Output 4: Action plan for NCCBM (responsibility: NCCBM, UNIDO)
 - 4.1 Consultation meeting with NCCBM
 - 4.2 Drafting of action plan
 - 4.3 Expert group meeting – technical review of action plan

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

After the completion of the diagnostic study, the next phase develops the missing capacity that was identified as a result of the inception phase. This took place primarily within the frame of implementing an action plan. This output is process by which skills and capacity will be upgraded through mechanisms of technology transfer (transfer, adaptation, and implementation); structured and focused expert dialogue; international study tours; twinning programmes; and mechanisms of training and learning-by-doing.

5. Output 5: Skills and technical capacity and capability of NCCBM upgraded (responsibility: NCCBM, UNIDO, BIS)
 - 5.1 State of the art technologies transferred (transfer, adaptation, implementation) to NCCBM
 - 5.2 Curricula development for NCCBM skills development
 - 5.3 Six technical workshops on:
 - Energy usage and energy efficient solutions

- Waste derived fuels
- CO2 emissions and green technologies
- Patents and Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs)
- Global best practices
- Up-to-date technologies

5.4 Skills development of NCCBM female and male staff

5.5 Training of female and male trainers in order to create self-sufficiency and sustainability

5.6 International study tours, 8 female and male scientists/engineers

5.7 International fellowship tours, 32 female and male scientists/engineers

5.8 NCCBM to coordinate with Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) for the development of new standards for the cement sector

POST - IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

The final two stages of the project in the post implementation phase are reporting and evaluation. Drafting and presentation of the final report enables for experiences gained throughout the project to be codified and disseminated. The final report may be used as a tool for the purposes of providing evidence-based policy advice to the GoI, pertaining to the cement sector. Recommendations for gender issues are also provided. A final meeting with stakeholders and DIPP was conducted to present what has been done and achieved with the use of the KPIs and targets identified during the inception phase. The rationale for this is to increase the outreach of NCCBM to its client base and to present the portfolio of new improved services offered.

6. Output 6: Final report (lessons learned, implications, advocacy) – Responsibility NCCBM, UNIDO

6.1 Drafting of final report

6.2 Presentation of final report

6.3 Development of a sliding price scale for services offered by NCCBM

6.4 PR and marketing of NCCBM's improved service portfolio

7. Output 7: Evaluation Report (Responsibility UNIDO)

7.1 Independent evaluation

Paper Project

The final goal of the project is to strengthen the global competitive position of the Indian paper and pulp sector. With this regard, despite the fact that the Indian paper industry holds its importance to the national economy, it stands very fragmented and dominated by small and medium-sized units.

There is a strong need to close up the increasing gap between demand and supply by increasing firms' productivity and resource efficiency by introducing new and more advanced technologies as well as through skills development. There is a growing need to modernize the Indian mills, improve productivity and build new capacities.

In order to achieve this goal it is imperative that the capacity and capability of technical institutions such as the Indian Paper Manufacturers Association (IPMA), the Central Paper and Pulp Research Institute (CPPRI), the Indian Agro and Recycled Paper Mills Association (IARPMA), the Indian Newsprint Manufacturer's Association (INMA) and the Indian Recycled Paper Mills Association (IRPMA) are bolstered. With this in mind this project aims to increase the technical capacity and capability of IPMA, CPPRI, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA so that it can better support the Indian paper and pulp sector and increase its global competitiveness.

The project consists of 8 different outputs, 5 in the Inception phase, 2 in the implementation phase and 1 in the post-implementation.

Project implementation arrangements

INCEPTION PHASE

The inception phase planning and logistics activities have been carried out with the aim of ensuring that all key stakeholders are on board and that planned activities are in line with the expected goal.

During this stage the following outputs have been achieved:

1. Output 1: Identification of target clusters/units (Responsibility: CPPRI, UNIDO)
 - 1.1 Analysis of the database of potential clusters/ units in 4 regions- South, North, West and East
 - 1.2 Consultation meetings with the stakeholders and identification of potential target units for diagnostic study/ technology status
2. Output 2: Reports of the pulp and paper sector (Responsibility: CPPRI, UNIDO)
 - 2.1 Study of the technology status of the paper and pulp sector with a focus on selected clusters in India
 - 2.2 Review of global best practices and state of the art technologies, including green technologies, for the paper and pulp sector
 - 2.3 Analysis of results and drafting of findings (activities 2.1-2.2)
3. Output 3: Diagnostic studies of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and selected units (Responsibility: CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO)
 - 3.1 Assessment of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA on key aspects: R&D infrastructure/ skills, gaps faced and the requirement of international and technical support network, etc. Information will be disaggregated by sex
 - 3.2 Analysis of the prevalent technologies used and the issues/technology gaps faced by the selected units
 - 3.2 Conduct analysis such as: SWOT, five forces, and PEST or PESTLE
 - 3.4 Analysis of results and drafting of findings (activities 3.1-3.3)
4. Output 4: List of KPIs (Responsibility: UNIDO)

4.1 Utilise a six step process for the development of KPIs, namely:

- Step 1 – Create objective
- Step 2 – Describe results
- Step 3 – Identify measures
- Step 4 – Define thresholds
- Step 5 – Upload structure/data into a performance management system
- Step 6 – Interpret results

5. Output 5: Action plan for CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and industry associations (Responsibility: CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO)

- 5.1 Review meeting with stakeholders
- 5.2 Drafting of action plan for capacity building
- 5.3 Expert group meeting – technical review of action plan

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

During the implementation phase, a full package of mechanisms has been put in place to support the project goal. In particular, activities of skills, knowledge and technology transfer, together with study tours, twinning programs, training of trainers and structured expert dialogue have been carried out.

6. Output 6: Skills and technical capacity of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA upgraded (Responsibility: CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO)

6.1 Technology demonstration (lab/bench scale)/transfer (know-how/ knowledge) to CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and clusters and units. The potential areas are:

- improved energy efficiency and chemical recovery from non-wood based black liquor using liquor heat treatment or other process
- biochemical/membrane separation process for reduction of colour and total dissolved solids (TDS) in effluent
- promotion and adaption of zone leaching in medium- sized agro and wood based paper mills

6.2 Four knowledge dissemination workshops (one for each region East, West, North and South) on:

- productivity enhancement in recycled fibre (RCF) based mills with new recycling and paper making concept
- other available environmentally sound technologies and processes including biotechnology applications
- global best practices in paper and pulp manufacturing

6.3 International study tours

6.4 Twinning of industrial associations and technical institutions with international equivalents

6.5 International fellowship tours, 20 female and male scientists/engineers

6.6 Training of trainers in order to create self-sufficiency and sustainability and upscaling

7. Output 7: Final report (lessons learned, implications, advocacy)

- 7.1 Drafting of final report
- 7.2 Presentation of final report
- 7.3 Development of a sliding price scale for services offered by CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA
- 7.4 PR and marketing of improved service portfolio of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA

POST - IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

The final two stages of the project in the post implementation phase are reporting and evaluation. The final report is conceived be used as a tool for the purposes of providing evidence-based policy advice to the GoI, pertaining to the paper and pulp sector. Finally, an independent evaluation is planned to take place in the first quarter of 2018.

- 8. Output 8: Evaluation (Responsibility: UNIDO)

4. Implementation under International Centre for Inclusive & Sustainable Industrial Development (IC-ISID)

Both the two projects are under a joint initiative of the Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion (DIPP), UNIDO's national counterpart in India, and UNIDO. In 2015 two of previously existing centres were brought together under this joint initiative, respectively the International Centre for South-South Cooperation (ICSSC) and the International Centre for Advancement of Manufacturing Technology (ICAMT). IC-ISID works to promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization both within India (by facilitating the transfer and dissemination of international good practices and techniques) and outside India (by facilitating the application of good practices and techniques from India in other developing countries). Administratively, IC-ISID is managed through different projects, which though for the purpose of the present evaluation will be regarded as components of the IC-ISID, respectively one umbrella project (for management and administration of IC-ISID), five sector focused projects in India and two South-South Cooperation projects in Africa. Specifically these are:

- 1) International Centre for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (IC-ISID) (the umbrella project);
- 2) Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the cement sector;
- 3) Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the paper and pulp sector;
- 4) Kanpur leather development project 2015-2017;
- 5) Development and adoption of appropriate technologies for enhancing productivity in the Indian bicycle and bicycle parts;
- 6) UNIDO-DIPP Partnership on clusters and value chain development in industrial corridors (so far only PA);
- 7) Strengthening the technical service capacities of the Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute (KIRDI) in collaboration with the framework of the Kenya Subcontracting and Partnership in Coastal Provinces of Kenya; and
- 8) Promotion of neem-based bio-pesticides in West Africa (Ghana, Nigeria and Sierra Leone).

5. Budget information:

Table 1a. Cement Project - Financing plan summary - Output breakdown³

³ Source: Project document.

Project outputs/components	Total (\$)
1 Reports of the cement sector	60,000
2 Diagnostic studies of NCCBM	70,000
3 Development of KPIs	30,000
4 Action plan for NCCBM	135,000
5 Skills and technical capacity and capability of NCCBM upgraded	725,000
6 Final report (lessons learned, implications, advocacy)	74,500
Monitoring and evaluation	30,000
Total	1,124,500

Table 1b. Paper Project - Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown⁴

Project outcomes/components	Total (\$)
1. Identification of target clusters/units	25,000
2. Report of the pulp and paper sector	50,000
3. Diagnostic studies of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and selected units.	210,000
4. List of KPIs	30,000
5. Action plan for CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and industry associations	135,000
6. Skills and technical capacity of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA upgraded.	900,000
7. Final report (lessons learned, implications, advocacy)	75,000
Monitoring and evaluation	30,000
Total	1,455,000

⁴ Source: Project document.

Table 2a. Cement Project - UNIDO budget execution

Item	2015	2016	2017 (Jan-Nov)	Total Expenditure (\$)
Contractual Services			69,995	69,995
Local travel	7,769	39,103	29,685	76,557
Nat.Consult./Staff		10,494	11,312	21,806
Other Direct Costs	14	9,096	38,108	47,218
Staff & Intern Consultants		258,672	102,984	361,656
Staff Travel		8,108	7,707	15,815
Train/Fellowship/Study		61,430	176,254	237,684
Grand Total	14	386,903	438,062	830,731

Source: SAP, December, 2017

Table 2b. Paper Project - UNIDO budget execution

Item	2016	2017 (Jan – Nov)	Total Expenditure (\$)
Contractual Services	235,983	140,545	376,528
Local travel	22,583	67,871	90,454
Nat.Consult./Staff	31,264	35,956	67,220
Other Direct Costs	2,422	11,587	14,009
Staff & Intern Consultants	22,325	28,351	50,676
Staff Travel	8,456	19,936	28,392
Train/Fellowship/Study	101,412	108,481	209,893
Grand Total	426,461	414,744	837,172

Source: SAP, December, 2017

II. Evaluation purpose and scope

The purpose of the evaluation is to independently assess the two projects to help UNIDO improve performance and results of future programmes and projects.

The evaluation has three specific objectives:

- (i) Assess the project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and progress to impact;
- (ii) Develop a series of findings, lessons and recommendations for enhancing the design of new and implementation of ongoing projects by UNIDO.
- (iii) Assess the partnership between UNIDO-IC-ISID to feed into the Evaluation of the UNIDO Country Programme in India, which is conducted in tandem with the two project evaluations.

The independent terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the projects from their starting time in October 2015 to the estimated completion date in 03/31/2018. During the extension period from the original completion date of September 2017 to 31 March 2018, several additional activities have been implemented.

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy⁵ and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle⁶.

The evaluation will be carried out as an independent in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project will be informed and consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team leader will liaise with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The evaluation will use a theory of change approach and mixed methods to collect data and information from a range of sources and informants. It will pay attention to triangulating the data and information collected before forming its assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning.

The theory of change will identify causal and transformational pathways from the project outputs to outcomes and longer-term impacts, and drivers as well as barriers to achieve them. The learning from this analysis will be useful to feed into the design of the future projects so that the management team can effectively manage them based on results.

1. Data collection methods

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

- (a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:
 - The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports, mid-term review report, output reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.
 - Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project.
- (b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
 - UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
 - Representatives of donors and counterparts.

⁵ UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)

⁶ UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

- (c) **Field visit** to project sites in India

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

The key evaluation questions are the following:

- (a) What are the key drivers and barriers to achieve the long term objectives? To what extent has the project helped put in place the conditions likely to address the drivers, overcome barriers and contribute to the long term objectives?
- (b) How well has the project performed? Has the project done the right things? Has the project done things right, with good value for money?
- (c) What have been the project's key results (outputs, outcome and impact, if possible)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved against the project design? To what extent the achieved results will sustain after the completion of the project?
- (d) What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful practices in designing, implementing and managing the project?

The evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of the project results after the project completion. The assessment will identify key risks (e.g. in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and explain how these risks may affect the continuation of results after the project ends. Table 1 below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The details questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2.

Table 1. Project evaluation criteria

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
A	Impact (or progress toward impact)	Yes
B	Project design	Yes
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
C	Project performance	Yes
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• M&E: ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
E	Performance of partners	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• Donor	Yes

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
F	Overall assessment	Yes

3. Rating system

In line with the practice adopted by many development agencies, the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division uses a six-point rating system, where 6 is the highest score (highly satisfactory) and 1 is the lowest (highly unsatisfactory) as per Table 2.

Table 2. Project rating criteria

Score	Definition	Category
6	Highly satisfactory Level of achievement clearly exceeds expectations and there is no shortcoming.	SATISFACTORY
5	Satisfactory Level of achievement meets expectations (indicatively, over 80-95 per cent) and there is no or minor shortcoming.	
4	Moderately satisfactory Level of achievement more or less meets expectations (indicatively, 60 to 80 per cent) and there are some shortcomings.	
3	Moderately unsatisfactory Level of achievement is somewhat lower than expected (indicatively, less than 60 per cent) and there are significant shortcomings.	UNSATISFACTORY
2	Unsatisfactory Level of achievement is substantially lower than expected and there are major shortcomings.	
1	Highly unsatisfactory Level of achievement is negligible and there are severe shortcomings.	

IV. Evaluation process

The evaluation will be implemented in five phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- i. Desk review and data analysis;
- ii. Interviews, survey and literature review;
- iii. Field visits;
- iv. Data analysis and report writing.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in the first quarter of 2018. The evaluation field mission to India is tentatively planned for February 2018. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project.

After the evaluation field mission, the evaluation team leader will visit UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the terminal evaluation. The draft TE report will be submitted to UNIDO 3 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft TE report is to be shared with the UNIDO IEV, UNIDO Project Manager and other stakeholders for comments and verification of factual and

interpretation errors. The TE leader is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version in accordance with UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV standards.

Table 3. Tentative schedule

Timelines	Tasks
January 2018	Desk review and preparation of inception report
22 January -3 February 2018	Briefing with UNIDO Project Manager and experts based in Vienna – through Skype
11-23 February 2018	Field visits
5-6 March 2018	Debriefing in Vienna Presentation of evaluation findings
March 2018	Preparation of first draft evaluation report Internal peer review of the report by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV and other stakeholders comments to draft evaluation report
April 2018	Final evaluation report

VI. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one national consultant. The evaluation team will possess relevant strong experience and expertise on evaluation and on private sector development. Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO.

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions annexed to these terms of reference.

According to UNIDO Evaluation Policy, members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the project under evaluation.

An evaluation manager from UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV will provide technical backstopping to the evaluation team and ensure the quality of the evaluation. The UNIDO Project Manager and national project teams will act as resourced persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the evaluation manager. The UNIDO Project Manager and the project team in India will provide logistical and administrative support the evaluation team to prepare for the field visits. The project team will provide a proposed list of stakeholders (e.g. government officials, private sector representatives and other relevant individuals) to the evaluation team who will make the final decision on who to consult. The project team will arrange the meetings and prepare field visit schedule for the evaluation team, following their request, prior to the field visit.

The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with the representatives of UNIDO, other UN agencies as well as with the concerned national agencies, and with national and international project staff. The evaluation team is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment.

However, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor or UNIDO.

VII. Reporting

Evaluation report format and review procedures

A draft report for each project will be delivered to ODG/EVQ/IEV (the suggested report outline is in Annex 4) and circulated to UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft reports provided by the stakeholders will be sent to UNIDO ODG/EVA for collation and onward transmission to the project evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

The evaluation team will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feed-back in preparing the evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ after the field mission.

The TE report of each project should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 1.

VIII. Quality assurance

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV).

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex 4. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV, which will submit the report to the donor and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

Annex 1: Project Results Framework

The detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and Risk Assessment Plan, which were both developed and implemented for this project will be shared with the evaluation expert once recruited.

Cement Project

INCEPTION PHASE	
Output 1: Reports on the cement sector	
<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
1.1 Review of global best practices on management of the cement sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO
1.2 Global view of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Energy usage and energy efficient solutions ○ Waste derived fuels ○ CO2 emissions and green technologies ○ Patents and IPRs ○ Global best practices ○ Up-to-date technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO PTC/BIT, ENE,ENV
1.3 Analysis of results (activities 1.1-1.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO
1.4 Drafting of findings (activities 1.1-1.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO
Output 2: Diagnostic study of NCCBM	
<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
2.1 Analysis of the issues/technology gaps faced by NCCBM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
2.2 Analysis of the skills gaps faced by NCCBM. Information will be disaggregated by sex.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
2.3 Analysis of the gaps in management best practices faced by NCCBM. Information will be disaggregated by sex.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
2.4 Analysis of NCCBMs international and technical support network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
2.5 Analysis of current technology types promoted by NCCBM (the usage of energy, type of process, fuel type, CO2 emissions, waste, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO PTC/BIT, ENE,ENV
2.6 Drafting of findings as a report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
Output 3: List of KPIs	
<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
3.1 Utilise a six step process for the development of KPIs, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Step 1 – Create objective ○ Step 2 – Describe results ○ Step 3 – Identify measures ○ Step 4 – Define thresholds ○ Step 5 – Upload structure/data into a performance management system ○ Step 6 – Interpret results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO

Output 4: Action plan for NCCBM	
<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
4.1 Consultation meeting with NCCBM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO
4.2 Drafting of action plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO • PTC/BIT, ENE, ENV
4.3 Expert group meeting – technical review of action plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • UNIDO • PTC/BIT, ENE, ENV
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PHASE	
Output 5: Skills and technical capacity and capability of NCCBM upgraded	
<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
5.1 State of the art technologies transferred ³ (transfer, adaptation, implementation) to NCCBM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO • NCCBM
5.2 Curricula development for NCCBM skills development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO • NCCBM
5.3 Six technical workshops on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Energy usage and energy efficient solutions ○ Waste derived fuels ○ CO2 emissions and green technologies ○ Patents and IPRs ○ Global best practices ○ Up-to-date technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO • PTC/BIT, ENE, ENV • NCCBM
5.4 Skills development of NCCBM female and male staff ⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
5.5 Training of female and male trainers in order to create self-sufficiency and sustainability and upscaling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
5.6 International study tours, 8 female and male scientists/engineers (10 days)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
5.7 International fellowship tours, 32 female and male scientists/engineers (25 days)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
5.8 NCCBM to coordinate with Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) for the development of new standards for the cement sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM • BIS

POST IMPLEMENTATION PHASE	
Output 6: Final report (lessons learned, implications, advocacy)	
<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
6.1 Drafting of final report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
6.2 Presentation of final report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO
6.3 Development of a sliding price scale for services offered by NCCBM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCBM
6.4 PR and marketing of NCCBM's improved service portfolio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO • NCCBM
Output 7: Evaluation report	
<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
7.1 Independent evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIDO

Paper Project

INCEPTION PHASE	
Output 1: Identification of target clusters/units	
Activities	Responsibility
1.1 Analysis of the database of potential clusters/ units in 4 regions- South, North, West and East	CPPRI, UNIDO
1.2 Consultation meetings with the stakeholders and identification of potential target units for diagnostic study/ technology status	CPPRI, UNIDO
Output 2: Reports of the pulp and paper sector	
Activities	Responsibility
2.1 Study of the technology status of the paper and pulp sector with a focus on selected clusters in India	CPPRI, UNIDO
2.2 Review of global best practices and state of the art technologies, including green technologies, for the paper and pulp sector	CPPRI, UNIDO
2.3 Analysis of results and drafting of findings (activities 2.1-2.2)	CPPRI, UNIDO
Output 3: Diagnostic studies of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and selected units	
Activities	Responsibility
3.1 Assessment of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA on key aspects: R&D infrastructure/ skills, gaps faced and the requirement of international and technical support network, etc. Information will be disaggregated by sex.	UNIDO
3.2 Analysis of the prevalent technologies used and the issues/technology gaps faced by the selected units.	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
3.3 Conduct analysis such as: SWOT, five forces, and PEST or PESTLE ⁶ .	CPPRI, UNIDO
3.4 Analysis of results and drafting of findings (activities 3.1-3.3)	UNIDO
Output 4: List of KPIs	
Activities	Responsibility
4.1 Utilise a six step process for the development of KPIs, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Step 1 – Create objective ○ Step 2 – Describe results ○ Step 3 – Identify measures ○ Step 4 – Define thresholds ○ Step 5 – Upload structure/data into a performance management system ○ Step 6 – Interpret results Note: As it is crucial for reasons of sustainability, this process should be conducted in close collaboration with CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, this is an integral part of UNIDO's learning-by-doing approach ⁷	UNIDO

Output 5: Action plan for CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and industry associations	
Activities	Responsibility
5.1 Review meeting with stakeholders	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
5.2 Drafting of action plan for capacity building	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
5.3 Expert group meeting – technical review of action plan	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
IMPLEMENTATION PHASE	
Output 6: Skills and technical capacity of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA upgraded	
Activities	Responsibility
6.1 Technology demonstration (lab/bench scale)/transfer (know-how/ knowledge) to CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA and clusters and units. The potential areas are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improved energy efficiency and chemical recovery from non-wood based black liquor using liquor heat treatment or other process biochemical/membrane separation process for reduction of colour and total dissolved solids (TDS) in effluent promotion and adaption of zone leaching in medium-sized agro and wood based paper mills 	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
6.2 Four knowledge dissemination workshops (one for each region East, West, North and South) on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> productivity enhancement in recycled fibre (RCF) based mills with new recycling and paper making concept other available environmentally sound technologies and processes including biotechnology applications global best practices in paper and pulp manufacturing 	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
6.3 International study tours (details in Annex 7)	UNIDO
6.4 Twinning of industrial associations and technical institutions with international equivalents	UNIDO, DIPP
6.5 International fellowship tours, 20 female and male scientists/engineers (14 days)	UNIDO
6.6 Training of trainers in order to create self-sufficiency and sustainability and upscaling	UNIDO
Output 7: Final report (lessons learned, implications, advocacy)	
Activities	Responsibility
7.1 Drafting of final report	UNIDO
7.2 Presentation of final report	UNIDO
7.3 Development of a sliding price scale for services offered by CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
7.4 PR and marketing of improved service portfolio of CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA, IRPMA	CPPRI, IPMA, IARPMA, INMA and IRPMA, UNIDO
POST IMPLEMENTATION PHASE	
Output 8: Evaluation	
Activities	Responsibility
8.1 Independent evaluation	UNIDO

Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

The evaluation team will assess the project performance guided by the questions below. It should be noted that these are the guiding questions. In the inception report, the evaluator will specify key issues and key questions for the evaluation to focus on.

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
A	<p>Progress to impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Mainstreaming</u>: To what extent information, lessons or specific results of the project are incorporated into broader stakeholder mandates and initiatives such as laws, policies, regulations and project? ✓ <u>Replication</u>: To what extent the project's specific results (e.g. methodology, technology, lessons and etc) are reproduced or adopted ✓ <u>Scaling-up</u>: To what extent the project's initiatives and results are implemented at larger geographical scale? ✓ What difference has the project made to the beneficiaries? ✓ What is the change attributable to the project? To what extent? ✓ What are the social, economic, environmental and other effects, either short-, medium- or long-term, on a micro- or macro-level? ✓ What effects are intended or unintended, positive or negative? <p>The three UNIDO impact dimensions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Safeguarding environment</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in the status of environment? ✓ <u>Economic performance</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in the economic performance (finances, income, costs saving, expenditure and etc) of individuals, groups and entities? ✓ <u>Social inclusiveness</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in capacity and capability of individuals, groups and entities in society, including vulnerable groups, and hence generating employment and access to education and training?
B	<p>Project design</p>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Overall design</u> ✓ The problem, need or gap to be addressed by the project is clearly identified, with clear target beneficiaries? ✓ The project design was adequate to address the problems at hand? ✓ Is the project consistent with the Country's priorities, in the work plan of the lead national counterpart? Does it meet the needs of the target group? Is it consistent with UNIDO's Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development? Does it adequately reflect lessons learnt from past projects? Is it in line with the donor's priorities and policies? ✓ Is the applied project approach sound and appropriate? Is the design technically feasible and based on best practices? Does UNIDO have in-house technical expertise and experience for this type of intervention? ✓ To what extent the project design (in terms of funding, institutional arrangement, implementation arrangements...) as foreseen in the project document still valid and relevant? ✓ Does it include M&E plan and adequate budget for M&E activities? ✓ Risk management: Are critical risks related to financial, social-political, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects identified with specific risk ratings? Are their mitigation measures identified? Where possible, are the mitigation measures included in project activities/outputs and monitored under the M&E plan?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Logframe</u> ✓ Expected results: Is the expected result-chain (impact, outcomes and outputs) clear and logical? Does impact describe a desired long-term change or benefit to a society or community (not as a mean or process), do outcomes describe change in target group's behaviour/performance or system/institutional

	<p>performance, do outputs describe deliverables that project will produce to achieve outcomes? Are the expected results realistic, measurable and not a reformulation or summary of lower level results? Do outputs plus assumptions lead to outcomes, do outcomes plus assumptions lead to impact? Can all outputs be delivered by the project, are outcomes outside UNIDO's control but within its influence?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Indicators: Do indicators describe and specify expected results (impact, outcomes and outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and time? Do indicators change at each level of results and independent from indicators at higher and lower levels? Do indicators not restate expected results and not cause them? Are indicators necessary and sufficient and do they provide enough triangulation (cross-checking)? Are they indicators sex-diaggregated, if applicable? Are the indicator SMART? ✓ Sources of verification: Are the sources of verification/data able to verify status of indicators, are they cost-effective and reliable? Are the sources of verification/data able to verify status of output and outcome indicators before project completion? ✓ Are key assumptions properly summarized and reflecting the proper level in the results chain in the logframe?
C	Project performance
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Relevance</u> ✓ How does the project fulfil the urgent target group needs? ✓ To what extent is the project aligned with the development priorities of the country (national poverty reduction strategy, sector development strategy)? ✓ How does project reflect donor policies and priorities? ✓ Is the project a technically adequate solution to the development problem? Does it eliminate the cause of the problem? ✓ To what extent does the project correspond to UNIDO's comparative advantages? ✓ Are the original project objectives (expected results) still valid and pertinent to the target groups? If not, have they been revised? Are the revised objectives still valid in today's context?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Effectiveness</u> ✓ What are the main results (mainly outputs and outcomes) of the project? What have been the quantifiable results of the project? ✓ To what extent did the project achieve their objectives (outputs and outcomes), against the original/revised target(s)? ✓ What are the reasons for the achievement/non-achievement of the project objectives? ✓ What is the quality of the results? How do the stakeholders perceive them? What is the feedback of the beneficiaries and the stakeholders on the project effectiveness? ✓ To what extent is the identified progress result of the project attributable to the intervention rather than to external factors? ✓ What can be done to make the project more effective? ✓ Were the right target groups reached?
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Efficiency</u> ✓ How economically are the project resources/inputs (concerning funding, expertise, time...) being used to produce results? ✓ To what extent were expected results achieved within the original budget and timeframe? If no, please explain why. ✓ Are the results being achieved at an acceptable cost? Would alternative approaches accomplish the same results at less cost? ✓ What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used? Were the project expenditures in line with budgets? ✓ Could more have been achieved with the same input? ✓ Could the same have been achieved with less input? ✓ How timely was the project in producing outputs and outcomes? Comment on the delay or acceleration of the project's implementation period. ✓ To what extent were the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the

	<p>Project Team and annual Work Plans?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements?
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sustainability of benefits</u> ✓ Will the project results and benefits be sustained after the end of donor funding? ✓ Does the project have an exit strategy? ✓ To what extent the outputs and results have been institutionalized? <p><i>Financial risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the project ends? <p><i>Socio-political risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? ✓ What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? ✓ Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? ✓ Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? <p><i>Institutional framework and governance risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits? ✓ Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency and required technical know-how in place? <p><i>Environmental risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? ✓ Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to have adverse environmental impacts, which, in turn, might affect the sustainability of project benefits?
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Gender mainstreaming</u> ✓ Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? Was the gender marker assigned correctly at entry? ✓ Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)? Were there gender-related project indicators? ✓ Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/ included in the project? ✓ How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries? ✓ Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)? ✓ To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>M&E:</u> ○ M&E design ○ Was the M&E plan included in the project document? Was it practical and sufficient at the point of project approval? ○ Did it include baseline data and specify clear targets and appropriate indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results? ○ Did it include a proper M&E methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; ○ Does the M&E plan specify what, who and how frequent monitoring, review, evaluations and data collection will take place? Is the M&E plan consistent with the logframe (especially indicators and sources of verification)? ○ Does it allocate adequate budget for M&E activities?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M&E implementation ○ How was the information from M&E system used during the project implementation? Was an M&E system in place and did it facilitate timely tracking of progress toward project results by collecting information on selected indicators continually throughout the project implementation period? Did project team and manager make decisions and corrective actions based on analysis from M&E system and based on results achieved? ○ Are annual/progress project reports complete, accurate and timely? ○ Was the information provided by the M&E system used to improve performance and adapt to changing needs? Was information on project performance and results achievement being presented to the Project Steering Committee to make decisions and corrective actions? Do the Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information? ○ Are monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impact in the logframe? Do performance monitoring and reviews take place regularly? ○ Were resources for M&E sufficient? ○ How has the logframe been used for Monitoring and Evaluation purposes (developing M&E plan, setting M&E system, determining baseline and targets, annual implementation review by the Project Steering Committee...) to monitor progress towards expected outputs and outcomes? ○ How well have risks outlined the project document and in the logframe been monitored and managed? How often have risks been reviewed and updated? Has a risk management mechanism been put in place?
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Results-based management (RBM)</u> <p><i>Results-Based work planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved. ○ Are there any annual work plans? Are work-planning processes results-based? Has the logframe been used to determine the annual work plan (including key activities and milestone)? ○ Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. <p><i>Results-based monitoring and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Verify whether an M&E system is in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on selected indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; ○ Review the monitoring tool currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive? ○ Do project team and manager make decisions and corrective actions based on analysis from M&E system and based on results achieved? Is information on project performance and results achievement being presented to the Project Steering Committee to make decisions and corrective actions? Do the Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information? <p><i>Results-based reporting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the PSC. ○ Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil donor and UNIDO reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed delays or poor performance, if applicable?) ○ Assess how results and lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
E	Performance of partners

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>UNIDO</u> ○ Mobilization of adequate technical expertise for project design ○ Inclusiveness of project design (with national counterparts) ○ Previous evaluative evidence shaping project design ○ Planning for M&E and ensuring sufficient M&E budget ○ Timely recruitment of project staff ○ Project modifications following changes in context or after the Mid-Term Review ○ Follow-up to address implementation bottlenecks ○ Role of UNIDO country presence (if applicable) supporting the project ○ Engagement in policy dialogue to ensure up-scaling of innovations ○ Coordination function ○ Exit strategy, planned together with the government ○ Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement. ○ To what extent the project has a proper and operational governance system (e.g. PSC with clear roles and responsibilities)? ○ Review whether the national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)? ○ The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>National counterparts</u> ✓ Design ○ Responsiveness to UNIDO’s invitation for engagement in designing the project ✓ Implementation ○ Ownership of the project ○ Provide financial contribution as planned (cash or in-kind) ○ Support to the project, based on actions and policies ○ Counterpart funding ○ Internal government coordination ○ Exit strategy, planned together with UNIDO, or arrangements for continued funding of certain activities ○ Facilitation of the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations(NGOs), civil society and the private sector where appropriate ○ Suitable procurement procedures for timely project implementation ○ Engagement with UNIDO in policy dialogue to promote the up-scaling or replication of innovations
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Donor</u> ✓ Timely disbursement of project funds ✓ Feedback to progress reports, including Mid-Term Evaluation, if applicable ✓ Support by the donor’s country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue
F	<p>Overall assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under Project performance and Progress to Impact criteria above but not an average of ratings.

Annex 3: Job descriptions



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Title:	Senior International Evaluation Expert – Team leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	India and two missions to Vienna/Austria
Start of Contract (EOD):	2 January 2018
End of Contract (COB):	30 April 2018
Number of Working Days:	34 working days

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT (See evaluation terms of reference attached)

Duties: The senior international evaluation consultant will act as a Team leader in this project evaluation according to the terms of reference. She/he will be responsible for the preparation of the evaluation report, including the coordination of inputs from other team members. The Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed; Draft a Theory of Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; The TOC. Submitted to evaluation manager. 	7 days	Home-based
2. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; 	1 day	Vienna

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of evaluation tasks with the team member. 		
3. Conduct field mission in 2018 ⁷ .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the team member on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. 	12 days	India (project sites to be identified)
4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed 	1 days	Vienna, Austria
5. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the team member, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the team member and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report; Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report. 	10 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final evaluation report. 	3 days	Home-based
	TOTAL	34 days	

⁷ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Managerial competencies:

1. Strategy and direction
2. Judgement and decision making
3. Conflict resolution

Core competencies:

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Client orientation
5. Organizational development and innovation

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree preferably in economics, trade, development or related disciplines.

Technical and Functional Experience:

- At least 15 years of progressive and proven professional development experience in the field of evaluation, and knowledge of paper/cement sector is a plus;
- A minimum of ten years practical experience in the field of development projects, including evaluation experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries;
- Adequate understanding of local social and cultural issues;
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries;

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

Absence of Conflict of Interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the Office for Independent Evaluation.



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Title:	International expert – Team member
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	India and two missions to Vienna/Austria
Start of Contract (EOD):	January 2018
End of Contract (COB):	March 2018
Number of Working Days:	28 working days

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT (See evaluation terms of reference attached)

Duties: The international expert will act as a Team leader in this project evaluation according to the terms of reference. She/he will be responsible for the preparation of the evaluation report, including the coordination of inputs from other team members. He/she will perform the following tasks:

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Desk review Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information; in cooperation with the team leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in English (questionnaires, logic models); If need be, recommend adjustments to the tools in order to ensure their understanding in the local context; Analyze and assess the aspects related to quality infrastructure in the country, specifically in the context of the project’s objectives and targets. and tentative agenda for field work.	Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context; A stakeholder mapping.	5 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule • List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. • Prepare a map of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; 	3 days	Home-based
<p>Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required;</p> <p>Consult with the team leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</p> <p>Conduct the Hindi-English translation for the team leader while in the field visits.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. • Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks. 	12 days (including travel days)	India (10 days)
Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to Inception Report and as agreed with the Team Leader.	Draft analysis to the evaluation report prepared.	6 days	Home-based
Contribute to the revision of the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	Final evaluation report prepared.	2 days	Home-based
TOTAL		28 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Managerial competencies:

1. Strategy and direction
2. Judgement and decision making
3. Conflict resolution

Core competencies:

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Client orientation
5. Organizational development and innovation

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree preferably in economics, trade, engineering, development or related disciplines.

Technical and Functional Experience:

- A minimum of 10 years practical experience in the field of **paper/cement sector**
- Experience with evaluation of development projects will be an asset
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries in the region.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English and **Hindi** is required.

Absence of conflict of interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary (maximum 5 pages)

Evaluation purpose and methodology
Key findings
Conclusions and recommendations
Project ratings
Tabular overview of key findings – conclusions – recommendations

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Evaluation objectives and scope
- 1.2. Overview of the Project Context
- 1.3. Overview of the Project
- 1.4. Theory of Change
- 1.5. Evaluation Methodology
- 1.6. Limitations of the Evaluation

2. Project's contribution to Development Results - Effectiveness and Impact

- 2.1. Project's achieved results and overall effectiveness
- 2.2. Progress towards impact
 - 2.2.1. Behavioral change
 - 2.2.1.1. Economically competitive - Advancing economic competitiveness
 - 2.2.1.2. Environmentally sound – Safeguarding environment
 - 2.2.1.3. Socially inclusive – Creating shared prosperity
 - 2.2.2. Broader adoption
 - 2.2.2.1. Mainstreaming
 - 2.2.2.2. Replication
 - 2.2.2.3. Scaling-up

3. Project's quality and performance

- 3.1. Design
- 3.2. Relevance
- 3.3. Efficiency
- 3.4. Sustainability
- 3.5. Gender mainstreaming

4. Performance of Partners

- 4.1. UNIDO
- 4.2. National counterparts
- 4.3. Donor

5. Factors facilitating or limiting the achievement of results

- 5.1. Monitoring & evaluation
- 5.2. Results-Based Management
- 5.3. Other factors
- 5.4. Overarching assessment and rating table

6. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

- 6.1. Conclusions
- 6.2. Recommendations
- 6.3. Lessons learned
- 6.4. Good practices

Annexes (to be put online separately later)

- Evaluation Terms of Reference
- Evaluation framework
- List of documentation reviewed
- List of stakeholders consulted
- Project logframe/Theory of Change
- Primary data collection instruments: evaluation survey/questionnaire
- Statistical data from evaluation survey/questionnaire analysis

Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project Title:

UNIDO SAP ID:

Evaluation team:

Quality review done by:

Date:

Report quality criteria	UNIDO IEV assessment notes	Rating
a. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
b. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
c. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
d. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
e. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible? (Including assessment of assumptions, risks and impact drivers)		
f. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
g. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
h. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of both the M&E plan at entry and the system used during the implementation? Was the M&E sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation?		
i. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
j. Quality of the recommendations: did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can these be immediately implemented with current resources?		
k. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?		
l. Was the report delivered in a timely manner? (Observance of deadlines)		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

A rating scale of 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately satisfactory = 4, Moderately unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.